Electronic Supplementary Information

Synthesis of Multiphase MoS₂ Heterostructures using Temperature-controlled Plasmasulfurization for Photodetector Applications

Kubra Aydin^{a,b,†}, Chaitanya Kanade^{a,b,c,†}, Vinit Kaluram Kanade^{a,b}, Gulgun Bahit^d, Chisung Ahn^{e,*} and Taesung Kim^{a,b,d,f,*}

Dr. C. Ahn

E-mail: cahn@kitech.re.kr

Prof. T. Kim

E-mail: <u>tkim@skku.edu</u>

* Authors to whom correspondence should be addressed

MoS ₂	Method	Substrate	Gas	Flow Rate	Temperature	Process Time
Phase				[sccm]	[°C]	[h]
1T-MoS ₂	PECVD	Si	Ar:H ₂	10:10	150	1.5
2H-MoS ₂	PECVD	Si	Ar:H ₂	10:10	300	1.5

Table S1 Synthesis conditions for 1T- and 2H-MoS₂.

X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) analyses were performed on the 1T/1T- and 2H/2H-MoS₂ monostructures and 2H/1T-MoS₂ heterostructures, as shown in Figure S1. In Figure S1a, the peaks at approximately 229.2 and 232.6 eV correspond to the $3d_{5/2}$ and $3d_{3/2}$ peaks of Mo⁴⁺, respectively, corresponding to 2H-MoS₂.¹ The 1T-MoS₂ peaks were located at a lower energy of approximately 0.7 eV.² In Figure S1b, the S $2p_{3/2}$ and S $2p_{1/2}$ peaks were observed at 161.4 and 162.8 eV for the 1T phase, whereas the binding energies corresponding to 2H-MoS₂ corresponded to the 2H and 163.7 eV.³ In Figures S1c and S1d, all the peaks formed in 2H/2H-MoS₂ corresponded to the 2H phase. In the XPS graphs of 2H/1T-MoS₂ (Figures S1e and S1f for Mo 3d and S2p, respectively), the 2H and 1T phase peaks were located together, indicating that both phases were formed in the 2H/1T structure.



Figure S1. XPS surface analysis for (a) Mo 3d and (b) S 2p of 1T/1T-MoS₂; (c) Mo 3d and (d) S 2p of 2H/2H-MoS₂; and (e) Mo 3d and (f) S 2p of 2H/1T-MoS₂.

XPS depth profile analyses were performed to determine the elemental distribution from the surface to the interior of the 2H/1T-MoS₂ heterostructure. A high-energy Ar ion beam was used to etch the samples layer-by-layer at 120 s intervals for each etching cycle. An elemental distribution change from the 2H phase-related peak to the 1T phase-related peak in the XPS profiles from the surface to the lower layers was observed in the Mo 3d core peak profiles until the 4th cycle. In contrast, the peak initially formed at the S 2p core peak owing to the 2H phase decreased and broadened in the 2nd cycle and then disappeared in the 4th cycle. This decrease and broadening of the peak are due to the damage it causes to the Ar-ion beam S.⁴



Figure S2. 2H/1T-MoS₂ XPS depth profiling analysis for (a) the Mo 3d and (b) S 2p core peak levels.

The enlarged HRTEM images in Figures S3a and S3b show the trigonal lattice area of the 1T phase and common honeycomb lattice area of the 2H phase in 1T/1T- and 2H/2H-MoS₂, respectively.⁵ Unlike these two heterostructures, the 2H/1T-MoS₂ heterostructure exhibited an edge-exposed HRTEM image similar to that of 1T/2H-MoS₂.



Figure S3. HRTEM top view images of (a) the 1T/1T- and (b) 2H/2H-MoS₂ monostructures, and (c) 2H/1T-MoS₂ heterostructures.

The photoresponsivity and detectivity values of 1T/1T-, 2H/2H-, and 2H/1T-MoS₂ are shown in Figure S4 under illumination at 420, 530, 660, and 1050 nm. Although the photocurrent was 634 nA for the 1T/1T-MoS₂ monostructure, an equal change of 430 nA was observed for the 2H/2H-MoS₂ monostructure and the 2H/1T-MoS₂ heterostructures under light irradiation.



Figure S4. Current-voltage output curves of (a) $1T/1T-MoS_2$, (b) $2H/2H-MoS_2$, and (c) $2H/1T-MoS_2$ on Si under various wavelength illuminations. (d) Photoresponsivity and (e) detectivity analysis of 1T/1T-, 2H/2H- and $2H/1T-MoS_2$ under 5 μ W of 420, 530, 660, and 1050 nm laser.

Table S2. Comparison of the photoresponsivity, detectivity, and rise (τ_r) and decay (τ_D) times for the 1T/2H-MoS₂ heterostructure with other materials in the literature.

Material	Synthesis	Wavelength	Responsivity	Detectivity	Rise (τ_r) and	Reference
	Method	(nm)	(mA/W)	(Jones)	decay ($ au_d$)	
					times (ms)	
1T/2H-	PECVD	530	23.56	1.58×10^{9}	90, 30	This study
MoS_2						
MoS ₂ -ReS ₂	APCVD	800	42.61 ×10 ³	2.81×10^{13}	20, 19	6
MoS ₂ /p-Si	CVD	532	117×10^{3}	~109	84, 136	7
MoS_2/β -	Thermolysis	245	2.05	1.21×10^{11}	-	8
Ga_2O_3						
Ge-gated	Mechanical	520	2.18×10^{3}	-	15	9
MoS_2	Exfoliation					

MoS ₂ -	CVD	405	1.6×10^{7}	-	70, 12.2×10^3	10
GQDs						
SL MoS ₂	Mechanical	550	7.5	-	50	11]
	Exfoliation					

Calculations for photomeasurement study:

For 1T/2H heterostructure under 530 nm light source of P_{light} = 1 μ W power used.

 $I_{illumination} = 6.963 \times 10^{-07} \text{ A}$ $I_{dark} = 6.727 \times 10^{-07} \text{ A}$ $I_{photo} = I_{illumination} - I_{dark}$ $I_{photo} = 6.963 \times 10^{-07} - 6.727 \times 10^{-07}$ $I_{photo} = 2.356 \times 10^{-08} \text{ A}$

Responsivity calculated from using equation (1)

 $R = I_{photo}/P_{light} = 2.356 \times 10^{-08} \text{ A} / 1 \times 10^{-06} \text{ W} = 2.356 \times 10^{-02} \text{ A}/\text{W}$

Responsivity; R = 23.56 mA/W

The detectivity is calculated using equation (4)

 $D^* = R(A)^{1/2} / (2.e. I_{dark})^{1/2}$

Where; $R = 2.356 \times 10^{-02} \text{ A/W}$

Area between two electrodes due to light spread is bigger than the electrode area; Hence effective area is A = 95 μ m × 1020 μ m = 96900 μ m² = 9.69 × 10⁻⁴ cm²

E= electron/elementary charge = 1.6021×10^{-19} C

 $I_{dark} = 6.727 \times 10^{-07} A$

Detectivity; $D^* = R(A)^{1/2} / (2.e. I_{dark})^{1/2}$

= $2.356 \times 10^{-02} \times (9.69 \times 10^{-4})^{1/2} / (2 \times 1.6021 \times 10^{-19} \times 6.727 \times 10^{-07})^{\frac{1}{2}}$

 $= 1.58 \times 10^{09} \text{ cm} \cdot \text{Hz}^{1/2}/\text{W}$

= 1.58 × 10⁰⁹ Jones

References:

- [1] H. Fan, R. Wu, H. Liu, X. Yang, Y. Sun, C. Chen, J. Mater. Sci., 2018, 53, 10302.
- [2] G. Wang, G. Zhang, X. Ke, X. Chen, X. Chen, Y. Wang, G. Huang, J. Dong, S. Chu, M. Sui, Small, 2022, 18, 2107238.
- [3] X. Sun, Y. Pang, S. Li, Y. Yu, X. Ding, L. Wang, Q. Zhang, Ceram. Int., 2022, 48, 21358.
- [4] S. Hussain, J. Singh, D. Vikraman, A. K. Singh, M. Z. Iqbal, M. F. Khan, P. Kumar, D.-C. Choi, W. Song, K.-S. An, J. Eom, W.-G. Lee, J. Jung, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, 6, 30791.
- [5] L. Cai, J. He, Q. Liu, T. Yao, L. Chen, W. Yan, F. Hu, Y. Jiang, Y. Zhao, T. Hu, Z. Sun, S. Wei, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2015, 137, 2622.
- [6] R. Wadhwa, A. V. Agrawal, D. Kushavah, A. Mushtaq, S. K. Pal, M. Kumar, *Appl. Surf. Sci.*, 2021, 569, 150949.
- [7] X. Liu, F. Li, M. Xu, T. Shen, Z. Yang, W. Fan, J. Qi, *Langmuir*, 2018, 34, 14151.
- [8] R. Zhuo, D. Wu, Y. Wang, E. Wu, C. Jia, Z. Shi, T. Xu, Y. Tian, X. Li, J. Mater. Chem. C, 2018, 6, 10982.
- [9] S.-G. Kim, S.-H. Kim, J. Park, G.-S. Kim, J.-H. Park, K. C. Saraswat, J. Kim, H.-Y. Yu, ACS Nano, 2019, 13, 10294.
- [10] C. Chen, H. Qiao, S. Lin, C. M. Luk, Y. Liu, Z. Xu, J. Song, Y. Xue, D. Li, J. Yuan, W. Yu,
 C. Pan, S. P. Lau, Q. Bao, *Sci. Rep.*, 2015, 5, 1.
- [11] Z. Yin, H. Li, H. Li, L. Jiang, Y. Shi, Y. Sun, G. Lu, Q. Zhang, X. Chen, H. Zhang, ACS Nano, 2012, 6, 74.